

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Harold Anderson,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Civil Action No.: 2:10-cv-3180-TLW-RSC
)	
Attorney Christopher T. Posey,)	
Esquire; Mr. Randy Chambers,)	
Mr. Michael R. Watts; Miss)	
Susan W. Hudgins; Miss Diana)	
D. Cagle, <u>Case Files</u> ; Mr. Edward)	
W. Miller, <u>Case Files</u> ; Mr. P.R. Galuin,)	
<u>Case Files</u> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

ORDER

On December 16, 2010, the petitioner, Harold Anderson (“plaintiff”), proceeding pro se, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (Doc. #1). The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Robert S. Carr pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2), DSC.

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by the Magistrate Judge to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. # 9). On December 23, 2010, the Magistrate Judge issued the Report. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that this case be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. (Doc. # 9). The plaintiff filed no objections to the report. Objections were due on January 10, 2011.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. # 9). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, this case is **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. In light of this ruling, the plaintiff's motion to compel (Doc. # 3) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

April 27, 2011
Florence, South Carolina